

REMARKS CONCERNING THE AMENDMENTS

The above amendments were made in an effort to more clearly define the steps of some elements of the presently claimed invention. Claim 3 was added to claim 1. As claim 3 had been indicated as containing allowable subject matter if placed into independent form, the amending of claim 1 should place all remaining claims in condition for allowance.

SUMMARY OF THE OFFICE ACTION

1) Claims 1-2 and 5-16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Lamda (U.S. Patent No. 5,908,729) in view of Larson et al. (U.S. Patent Nos. 5,559,592) and Sato (US Patent No. 5,229,203).

2) Claims 17-24 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Lamda (U.S. Patent No. 5,908,729) or Larson et al. (U.S. Patent Nos. 5,559,592 or Sato (US Patent No. 5,229,203).

ARGUMENTS

1) Claims 1-2 and 5-16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Lamda (U.S. Patent No. 5,908,729) in view of Larson et al. (U.S. Patent Nos. 5,559,592) and Sato (US Patent No. 5,229,203).

The subject matter of claim 3 had been indicated as allowable if placed into independent form. Claim 3 has been incorporated into original claim 1 and therefore claim 1 and every claim dependent therefrom is now allowable. Claim 14 was cancelled as redundant after the amendment to claim 1 and the cancellation of claim 3.

2) Claims 17-24 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Lamda (U.S. Patent No. 5,908,729) or Larson et al. (U.S. Patent Nos. 5,559,592 or Sato (US Patent No. 5,229,203).

Claims 17-24 have been voluntarily cancelled. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute those claims in a continuation application.

CONCLUSION

The rejection must be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

TRUMAN F. KELLIE, et al.

By Their Representatives,

MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.

York Business Center, Suite 205

3209 West 76th Street

Edina, Minnesota 55435

(952) 832-9090

Date: 27 March 2006

By: 

Mark A. Litman

Reg. No. 26,390